



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,577	10/31/2003	Robert Hale Grant	112-0348US/233-605-USP	1563
85197	7590	03/09/2012		
Brocade-Wong Cabello Lutsch Rutherford & Brucculeri LLP 20333 Tomball Parkway, 6th Floor Houston, TX 77070			EXAMINER	
			SURVILLO, OLEG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2012	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

WCPatent@counselip.com
klutsch@counselip.com
sconroy@counselip.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/699,577	Applicant(s) GRANT ET AL.	
	Examiner OLEG SURVILLO	Art Unit 2442	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Oleg Survillo, Examiner AU 2442. (3) ____.
- (2) Keith Lutsch, Reg. No.: 31,851. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 05 March 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☒ 102 ☐ 103 ☒ Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Czeiger.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

discussed with Applicant's Attorney technical distinctions between claimed invention and prior art. Examiner pointed out that Czeiger is interpreted broadly to teach all the limitations of claim 1 where claimed "service" is interpreted as "login procedure" in Czeiger. Possible ways to amend around Czeiger were discussed such as incorporating certain features from Figure 4 that depicts specific services implemented in the gateway that are not the same "service" disclosed by Czeiger. It was agreed that non-final Office action will be mailed specifically stating reasons for rejecting claim 1 as anticipated by Czeiger giving applicants more time to form a complete response.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation, including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/Douglas B Blair/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442